

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/720,958		11/24/2003	Arun Ramakrishnan	03-1098/L13.12-0252	5206	
	7590 06/29/2005			EXAMINER		
	Tim R. Croll		·	RAO, SHRINIVAS H		
	LSI Logic Corn	LSI Logic Corporation				
	1621 Barber La		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	Milpitas, CA		2814			

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/720,958	RAMAKRISHNAN ET AL.	RAMAKRISHNAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Steven H. Rao	2814		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief								
before the rining of all Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Steven H. Rao	2814						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 13 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	HE REPLY FILED 13 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
 a) The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITTWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). 								
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee large inder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since					
AMENDMENTS	had a day of the state of the s							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co 			ecause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		i L below),						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37_CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canc non-allowable claim(s). :								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: / Claim(s) rejected: /								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	rit or other evidence is	s necessary and					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ls to provide a 1).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other: see continuation sheet.	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)						
		•						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' reply to the outstanding drawing requirements amounts to a noncompliant reply. However, Applicants' are advised that Examiner has applied the lastest MPEP (avialable on line) and the Examiners' clear instructions are correct. It is noted that if as Applicants' state in the amendment that the bracket on left hand side of figure 1 is intended to indicate exploded elements then the same must be placed within brackets (on both sides as required by 37 CFR 1.84 (h) (1)) and not a single bracket without any indication. The drawingrequirement is made Final. Appropriate correction is required. All three sheets include information regarding Applicants', phone number Attorney Docket number, etc. that should be deleted from the front sheet of the drawings.

it is noted that Applicants' are completely misreading 37 CFR 1.84(c) which requires identifying material to be placed on the BACK side and not front side as alleged by applicants' and attorney David Brush. The requirement that identifying material to be placed on the BACK side of each drawing sheet is made Final. Appropriate correction is required. This is clearest drawigns requirements that Examiner can provide..

Continuation of 13. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. because contrary to Applicants' contention Hosomi in figures 8-10, etc. and paras 0015,0031 and 0032 (Hosomi figures 8-10, paras 0031 and 0032). shows a second trace of a differential signal pair routed out of a bonding die area on a different one of layers than the first race of the differential signal pair, see also rejection above.. Applicants' silence regarding para 0015 (mentioned in Final rejection) is further proof that Hosomi teaches the limitations of the claims. Hosmi in other figures further teaches signal pair routing and other limitations presently recited. Applicants contention with respect to claims 13 and 22 Hosomi (see rejections of claims1-12 above) shows the routing of presently recited claim 13. Similarly Hosomi also shows the offset of presently recited claim 22.

86/24/05

PRIMARY EXAMINER